

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-8 and 12-15 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 7 being the independent claims.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-7 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0018349 to *Kinnunen et al.* (hereinafter, *Kinnunen*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,142,840 to *Geddes et al.* (hereinafter, *Geddes*). The Examiner rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kinnunen* in view of *Geddes* and U.S. Patent No. 5,794,142 to *Vanttila et al.* (hereinafter, *Vanttila*).

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 4-7 and 12-15, the Examiner contends that each element of Claim 1 is taught or suggested by the combination of *Kinnunen* and *Geddes*. More specifically, the Examiner contends that each element of Claim 1 is taught by *Kinnunen* with the exception of a text message that includes a service code corresponding to the at least one function that changes due to the change in the class of the user. The Examiner cites *Geddes* in an attempt to remedy this deficiency.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, in part, informing the user through a text message received by the mobile terminal from a mobile service provider of a change in the class of the user and the at least one function available to the user after the change of the user's class.

Kinnunen discloses a system for providing services to a plurality of mobile terminals, while *Geddes* discloses a system for authenticating and/or authorizing users of a service.

Kinnunen describes a service view agent, which provides a remote update event to all of its Mobile Entities (MEs) that have subscribed for updates of services. The service view agent updates its view so that the user can see the current range of available services. However,

Kinnunen fails to disclose the reception of a text message indicating a change in the class of the user, as recited in Claim 1. Further, while *Kinnunen* describes services provided on a network, it fails to disclose functions of a mobile terminal, as recited in Claim 1. *Geddes* fails to remedy these deficiencies of *Kinnunen*. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of *Kinnunen* and *Geddes*.

The Examiner also rejected independent Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) contending that Claim 7 contained similar recitations as those set forth in Claim 1. Thus, in view of the above, Claim 7 is also patentable over the combination of *Kinnunen* and *Geddes*.


Regarding Claims 4-6 and 12-15, while not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 4-6 and 12-15 are also allowable for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejection of Claims 1, 4-7 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claim 8, we disagree. *Vanttila* fails to remedy the deficiencies of the combination of *Kinnunen* and *Geddes* described above. Thus, while not conceding the patentability of the dependent claim, *per se*, Claim 8 is also allowable for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Regarding new Claims 16 and 17, *Geddes* makes mention of the use of a text messaging function in providing confirmation requests, confirmation codes, and pass codes. The text messages are utilized by the system to request the confirmation code or pass code from a user. The user may then utilize the text messaging function to provide the confirmation or pass code to the system for access to a service. *Geddes* fails to disclose that the system provides a text message to a user that includes a service code, as recited in Claim 16 and 17. *Kinnunen* and *Vanttila* fail to remedy this deficiency of *Geddes*. Thus, Claims 16 and 17 are also patentable over the combination of *Kinnunen*, *Geddes* and *Vanttila*.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1, 4-8 and 12-17, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over a horizontal line.

Paul J. Farrell
Registration No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Ste. 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-3565